



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,392	03/12/2004	Yongjun Zhao	203027.003 Zhao	7334

7590 10/18/2006

TONG & ASSOCIATES  
Suite 400  
5850 Canoga Avenue  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

EXAMINER

CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/799,392	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZHAO, YONGJUN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Phuong-Thao Cao	<b>Art Unit</b> 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                 | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Application filed on 03/12/2004.
2. Claims 1-29 are pending.

### *Drawings*

3. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Fig. 1 and 7-8 as described in the specification. For example, placing a label, "computer", with element 22A of Fig. 1, would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A descriptive textual label for each numbered element in these figures would be needed to better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be labeled in the drawing. Optionally, the applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o), recited below:

"(n) Symbols. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office. They should contain as few words as possible."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 15 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the method" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 27 recites the limitations "the association" and "the key" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-2 and 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 1-2 and 5-11, these claims recite a method for sharing information on-line, but fails to recite a tangible result, a requirement for compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 101 in view of the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, published on 26 October 2005, which can be found at [http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/guidelines101\\_20051026.pdf](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf), particularly with respect to ANNEX IV Computer-Related Nonstatutory Subject Matter, beginning on page 50.

For a result to be tangible, it must be more than just a thought or a computation; it must have real-world value rather than an abstract result. For instance, note that the limitations of claims 3 and 4 are not rejected, since they recite the function of providing (interpreted as displaying) the data resulting from the operation of comparing to a user, whereas (for instance), claim 1 merely cites 'comparing the search query with the cookie entries stored in the individual storage devices' as the result.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12, 16-21 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Achlioptas (Publication No US 2004/0148275) in view of Kadayam et al. (Publication No US 2003/0212673).

As to claim 1, Achlioptas teaches:

“A method of sharing information on-line” (see Abstract), the method comprising:

“connecting a plurality of computers as a network, the plurality of computers being configured to be used by computer users” (see [0044] wherein a set of users represents a plurality of computer as disclosed since each user need a computer to access and use the system; also see [0045] and [0107]);

“providing individual storage devices to each of the plurality of computer.” (see [0104]);

“allowing the computer users to visit web pages” (see [0047]);

“creating cookie entries when the user visit web pages, each cookie entry comprising a description of contents of web pages” (see [0047] for disclosure of cookie information wherein photography web sites must be identified with a description relating to photography in cookies wherein each cookie is equivalent to Applicant’s “cookie entry”);

“storing the cookies entries of each computer user into their respective storage devices” (see [0047] wherein cookies must be stored in user computers);

“allowing at least one computer user to enter a search query” (see [0097]).

Achlioptas does not teach “comparing the search query with the cookie entries stored in the individual storage devices, thereby providing the user who entered the search query an option to limit within the web pages visited by the plurality of computer users”.

Kadayam et al. teach “comparing the search query with the cookie entries stored in the individual storage devices, thereby providing the user who entered the search query an option to limit within the web pages visited by the plurality of computer users” (see [0055] for searching cookies on the user terminal which is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language, and see Achlioptas, Abstract and [0047] for searching information from members of a social network).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Achlioptas by the teaching of Kadayam et al. to add the feature of searching cookies or comparing the search query with the cookies entries stored in the individual storage devices, since searching cookies in the individual storage devices allows a user to take advantage of the user and others’ previous Internet search experiences and provides the system more way to search for information in addition to search the private storage component (Achlioptas, [0039], [0044] and [0052]; and Kadayam et al., [0054] and [0055]). As a result, the system is more efficient and effective.

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as teaches:

“wherein each cookie entry comprises a uniform resource locator of the web page visited” (see [0047] for the disclosure of cookie information wherein web sites must be identified by a uniform resource locator or equivalent component).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“providing the user, who entered the search query with the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry that matched the search query” (see [0052] wherein a referral path to the requested information is equivalent to Applicant’s “uniform resource location”).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“alerting the computer user whose storage device contains a cookie entry that matches the search query” (see [0070] and [0071] wherein the disclosure of the user P contacting the user U with the request information indicates that the user P must be alerted or notified relating the request information).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“allowing the computer user, whose storage device contains a cookie entry that matches the search query, to deny the release of the uniform resource locator” (see [0053] for ability of users to refuse to assist in getting requested information which is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).



As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 6 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“disguising the computer user, whose storage device contains a cookie entry that matches the search query and who denied the release of the uniform resource locator, as a computer user without said cookie entry” (see [0053]).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“allowing the computer users to specify which computer user may run a search query through their individual storage devices” (see [0047] for “buddy list”; and information related to a people, as modified with the teaching of Kadayam et al., including cookies stored on their individual storage devices).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“allowing the computer users to specify which individual storage devices they want to have access” (see [0047] for “buddy list”; and information related to a people, as modified with the teaching of Kadayam et al., including cookies stored on their individual storage devices).

As to claim 12, Achlioptas teaches:

“A device” (see Abstract) comprising:

“a plurality of interconnected computers, each of the plurality of interconnected computers being configured to be used by a computer user, each of the plurality of interconnected computers comprising a storage device, each storage device being configured to store a cookie entry when the computer user using the respective computer visits a web page, the cookie entry comprising a description of web page content and a uniform resource locator of the web page” (see [0044], [0045] and [0104] for distributed network of individual computing systems which is equivalent to Applicant’s “plurality of interconnected computers”; see [0047] for disclosure of cookie information wherein photography web sites must be identified with a description relating to photography and different web sites must be identified with a URL or some equivalent component and wherein each cookie is equivalent to Applicant’s “cookie entry” and cookies must be stored in user computer’s storage device); and

“at least one processor in communication with the plurality of interconnected computer, the processor being configured to accept a search query from a computer user” (see [0070] wherein search engine is equivalent to Applicant’s “processor”).

Achlioptas does not teach “compare the search query with the cookie entry, and providing the computer user with the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry that match the search query”.

Kadayam et al. teach “compare the search query with the cookie entry, and provide the computer user with the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry that match the search

query”. (see [0055] for the teaching of searching cookies, and see Achlioptas, Abstract and [0047] and [0052] for searching and finding a match of requested information from members of a social network and returning a referral path which is equivalent to the uniform resource locator because both can be used to location the request information).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Achlioptas by the teaching of Kadayam et al. to add the feature of searching cookies or comparing the search query with the cookies entries stored in the individual storage devices, since searching cookies in the individual storage devices allows a user to take advantage of the user and others’ previous Internet search experiences and provides the system more way to search for information in addition to search the private storage component (Achlioptas, [0039], [0044] and [0052]; and Kadayam et al., [0054] and [0055]). As a result, the system is more efficient and effective.

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 12 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“the processor comprises a real time messenger program, the real time messenger program being configured to prompt the user to enter a search query” (see [0053] and [0070]).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“wherein the real time messenger program is configured to inform the user, who entered the search query with the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry that matched the search query” (see [0052] wherein a referral path to the requested information is equivalent to Applicant’s “uniform resource location”).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“wherein the real time messenger program is configured to allow users of the plurality of interconnected computers to pick which users may access their individual storage devices” (see [0047] for “buddy list”; and information related to a people, as modified with the teaching of Kadayam et al., including cookies stored on their individual storage devices).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“wherein the real time messenger program is configured to allow users of the plurality of interconnected computers to pick which individual storage devices they want to search” (see [0047] for “buddy list”; and information related to a people, as modified with the teaching of Kadayam et al., including cookies stored on their individual storage devices).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“wherein the real time messenger program is configured to notify the user whose individual storage device contained the cookie entry that matched the search query about the search, the real time messenger program being further configured to allow the user whose individual storage device contained the cookie entry that matched the search query to control the release of the uniform resource locator to the searching user” (see [0053]).

As to claim 21, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 20 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“wherein the real time messenger program is configured to allow the user whose individual storage device contained the cookie entry that matched the search query to edit information to be released to the searching user” (see [0053] for providing the requested information via instant messaging or email).

As to claim 22, Achlioptas teaches:

“A method of conducting an on-line search” (see [0052]), the method comprising:

“allowing a first user to visit at least one web page” (see [0047]);

“creating a cookie entry for the web page visited, the cookie entry comprising a description of web page content and a uniform resource locator of the web page” (see [0047] for

disclosure of cookie information wherein photography web sites must be identified with a description relating to photography and different web sites must be identified with a URL or some equivalent component and wherein each cookie is equivalent to Applicant's "cookie entry");

"storing the cookie entry to the storage device of the first user" (see [0047] wherein cookies must be stored in user computers);

"allowing a second user to enter a search query" (see [0070]).

Achlioptas does not teach "compare the search query with the cookie entry stored in the storage device of the first user"; and "forwarding the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry to the second user if the search query matches the description of the web page content".

Kadayam et al. teach "compare the search query with the cookie entry stored in the storage device of the first user" and "forwarding the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry to the second user if the search query matches the description of the web page content" (see [0055] for the teaching of searching cookies, and see Achlioptas, Abstract and [0047] and [0052] for searching and finding a match of requested information from members of a social network and returning a referral path which is equivalent to the uniform resource locator because both can be used to location the request information).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Achlioptas by the teaching of Kadayam et al. to add the feature of searching cookies or comparing the search query with the cookies entry stored in the individual storage devices, since searching cookies in the individual storage devices allows a user to take advantage of the user and others' previous Internet search experiences and provides

the system more way to search for information in addition to search the private storage component (Achlioptas, [0039], [0044] and [0052]; and Kadayam et al., [0054] and [0055]). As a result, the system is more efficient and effective.

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“alerting the first user of the search query and the identity of the second user, if the search query matches the description of the web page content” (see [0053] wherein user P is equivalent to Applicant’s “first user”, user U is equivalent to Applicant’s “second user”, and user P must know the search query and the identity of user U in order to contact user U as disclosed).

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 23 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“allowing the first user to prevent the forwarding the uniform resource locator to the second user” (see [0053] for ability of user to refuse to assist).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 24 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas as modified teaches:

“preventing the second user from knowing that the first user prevented the forwarding of the uniform resource locator” (see [0053] and [0077]).

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Achlioptas (Publication No US 2004/0148275) in view of Kadayam et al. (Publication No US 2003/0212673) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Mason et al. (US Patent No 5,835,735).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “storing the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry that matched the search query and releasing said uniform resource locator to the user who entered the search query when the user is connected to the network”.

Mason et al. teach “storing the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry that matched the search query and releasing said uniform resource locator to the user who entered the search query when the user is connected to the network” (see [column 17, lines 5-10] for asynchronous delivery of query results which is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Mason et al. to add a feature of asynchronous delivery of query results such as storing the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry that matched the search query and releasing said uniform resource locator to the user who entered the search query when the user is connected to the



Art Unit: 2164

network, since this feature allows the system to process search query when the user is off-line or working on something else and saves users of waiting time. As a result, the system with the feature of asynchronous delivery of query delivery of query results is more flexible and effective.

11. Claims 10, 11, 13-15 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Achlioptas (Publication No US 2004/0148275) in view of Kadayam et al. (Publication No US 2003/0212673) as applied to claims 2, 12 and 22 above, and further in view of Emens et al. (US Patent No 6,564,257).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “creating a key and associating said key to a uniform resource locator”.

Emens et al. teach “creating a key and associating said key to a uniform resource locator” (see [column 2, lines 30-35] and [column 3, lines 15-25]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et al. to add the feature of creating a key and associating said key to a uniform resource locator since this feature allows the system to protect a searchable repository containing a document locator (etc. URL) when a user searches the repository for the document locator (see Emens et al., [column 2, lines 15-35]).

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. teach “each cookie entry further comprises an expiration date” (see Achlioptas, [0047] for cookies which inherently include an expiration date).

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “the expiration date being configured to cause a change in the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry, the method further comprising updating the association of the key and the uniform resource locator after the expiration date”.

Emens et al. teach “the expiration data being configured to cause a change in the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry, the method further comprising updating the association of the key and the uniform resource locator after the expiration date” (see [column 3, lines 35-50] wherein time indicator is equivalent to Applicant’s “expiration date”).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et al. to add the feature of the expiration data being configured to cause a change in the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry, the method further comprising updating the association of the key and the uniform resource locator after the expiration date since this feature allows the system to effectively monitor the change of uniform resource locator and respond correspondingly to insure the valid data locator in the system.

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 12 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “a mapping service provider connected to the plurality of interconnected computers, the mapping service provider being configured to create a key for a uniform resource locator of a web page, associate the key to the uniform resource locator, and store said association”.

Emens et al. teach “a mapping service provider connected to the plurality of interconnected computers, the mapping service provider being configured to create a key for a uniform resource locator of a web page, associate the key to the uniform resource locator, and store said association” (see [column 2, lines 25-35 and 50-65], [column 3, lines 15-25 and 50-60] and Fig. 1 wherein Repository Protector is equivalent to Applicant’s “mapping service provider”).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et al. to add a mapping service provider connected to the plurality of interconnected computers and being configured to create a key, associate the key to a uniform resource locator and store said association since this feature allows the system to effectively protect a searchable repository containing a document locator (etc. URL) when a user searches the repository for the document locator (see Emens et al., [column 2, lines 15-35]).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “the processor is configured to cause the mapping service to update the stored association between the uniform resource locator and the key with at least one change in the uniform resource locator”.

Emens et al. teach “the processor is configured to cause the mapping service to update the stored association between the uniform resource locator and the key with at least one change in the uniform resource locator”. (see [column 3, lines 35-50] wherein the association is deleted when the expiration is reached).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et al. to add the feature of the processor is configured to cause the mapping service to update the stored association between the uniform resource locator and the key with at least one change in the uniform resource locator since this feature allows the system to effectively monitor the change of uniform resource locator and respond correspondingly to insure the validity of data locators in the system.

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. teach “the cookie entry further comprises an expiration date” (see Achlioptas, [0047] for cookies which inherently include an expiration date).

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “the expiration date being configured to cause a change in the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry, the method further

comprising allowing the mapping service provider to update the stored association between the uniform resource locator and the key with the change”.

Emens et al. teach “the occurrence of the expiration date being configured to cause a change in the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry, the method further comprising allowing the mapping service provider to update the stored association between the uniform resource locator and the key with the change” (see [column 3, lines 35-50] wherein time indicator is equivalent to Applicant’s “expiration date).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et al. to add the feature of the expiration date being configured to cause a change in the uniform resource locator of the cookie entry, the method further comprising allowing the mapping service provider to update the stored association between the uniform resource locator and the key with the change since this feature allows the system to effectively monitor the change of uniform resource locator and respond correspondingly to insure the valid data locator in the system.

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “associating a key with the uniform resource locator of the web page and forwarding the key instead of the uniform resource locator to the second user”.

Emens et al. teach “associating a key with the uniform resource locator of the web page and forwarding the key instead of the uniform resource locator to the second user” (see [column 2, lines 30-35] and [column 3, lines 25-35]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et al. to add a feature of associating a key with the uniform resource locator of the web page and forwarding the key instead of the uniform resource locator to the second user since this feature allows the system to effectively protect a searchable repository containing a document locator (etc. URL) when a user searches the repository for the document locator (see Emens et al., [column 2, lines 15-35]).

As to claim 27, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “providing a key storage device for storing the association of the key and the uniform resource locator”.

Emens et al. teach “providing a key storage device for storing the association of the key and the uniform resource locator” (see [column 3, lines 15-25] wherein URL Mapping Database is equivalent to Applicant’s “key storage device”).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et al. to add a feature of providing a key storage device for storing the association of the key and the uniform resource locator since this feature allows the system to effectively implement a

Art Unit: 2164

mechanism to protect a searchable repository containing a document locator (etc. URL) when a user searches the repository for the document locator (see Emens et al., [column 2, lines 15-35]).

As to claim 28, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 27 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “resolving the uniform resource locator from the key storage device and forwarding the uniform resource locator to the second user”.

Emens et al. teach “resolving the uniform resource locator from the key storage device and forwarding the uniform resource locator to the second user” (see [column 3, lines 50-57] wherein URL Mapping Database is equivalent to Applicant’s “key storage device”).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et al. to add a feature of resolving the uniform resource locator from the key storage device and forwarding the uniform resource locator to the second user since this feature allows the system effective way to control the validity of the uniform resource locator.

12. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Achlioptas (Publication No US 2004/0148275) in view of Emens et al. (US Patent No 6,564,257) and Kadayam et al. (Publication No US 2003/0212673).

As to claim 29, Achlioptas teaches:

“A device” (see Abstract) comprising:

“a first computer, the first computer comprising a first storage device, the first computer being configured to be used by a first user, the first storage device being configured to store at least one cookie entry, the cookie entry comprising a description of the web page visited by the first user and a uniform resource locator corresponding the web page” (see [0047] for disclosure of cookie information wherein photography web sites must be identified with a description relating to photography and different web sites must be identified with a URL or some equivalent component and wherein each cookie is equivalent to Applicant’s “cookie entry” and cookies must be stored in user computer’s storage device);

“a second computer connected to the first computer the second computer comprising a second storage device, the second computer being configured to be used by the second user, the second storage device being configured to store at least one cookie entry, the cookie entry comprising a description of the web page visited by the second user and a uniform resource locator corresponding the web page” (see [0107] for a network of computers and see [0047] for disclosure of cookie information wherein photography web sites must be identified with a description relating to photography and different web sites must be identified with a URL or some equivalent component and wherein each cookie is equivalent to Applicant’s “cookie entry” and cookies must be stored in user computer’s storage device).

Achlioptas does not teach “a mapping service computer in communication with the first computer, the mapping service computer being configured to associate an individual key to each uniform resource locators stored in the first and second storage devices, the mapping service computer being further configured to stored the associations between the key and the uniform resource locator”.



Emens et al. teach “a mapping service computer in communication with the first computer, the mapping service computer being configured to associate an individual key to each uniform resource locators stored in the first and second storage devices, the mapping service computer being further configured to stored the associations between the key and the uniform resource locator” (see Fig. 1, [column 2, lines 50-65] and [column 3, lines 15-25] wherein the association of key and URL stored in URL Mapping Database of the Repository Protector which is equivalent to “mapping service computer”).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas by the teaching of Emens to add a mapping service computer with function as cited since “a mapping service computer in communication with the first computer, the mapping service computer being configured to associate an individual key to each uniform resource locators stored in the first and second storage devices, the mapping service computer being further configured to stored the associations between the key and the uniform resource locator” provides the system with an effective way to monitor and control over the change of the uniform resource locator of interest information.

Achlioptas and Emens et al. teach:

“wherein the first user may enter a search query and cause the second computer to accept the search query” (see Achlioptas, [0052]).

Achlioptas and Emens et al. do not teach “compare the search query with the cookie entry stored in the second storage device; if the search query matches the stored description of the web page, the second computer being configured to provide the key to the first computer”.

Kadayam et al. teach “compare the search query with the cookie entry stored in the second storage device; if the search query matches the stored description of the web page, the second computer being configured to provide the key to the first computer” (see [0055] for the teaching of searching cookies, and see Achlioptas, Abstract and [0047] and [0052] for searching and finding a match of requested information from members of a social network and Emens et al., [column 3, lines 25-35] wherein keys substituted for the URLs).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Achlioptas by the teaching of Kadayam et al. to add the feature of searching cookies or comparing the search query with the cookies entry stored in the individual storage devices, since searching cookies in the individual storage devices allows a user to take advantage of the user and others’ previous Internet search experiences and provides the system more way to search for information in addition to search the private storage component (Achlioptas, [0039], [0044] and [0052]; and Kadayam et al., [0054] and [0055]). As a result, the system is more efficient and effective.

Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. do not teach “the first computer being configured to cause the mapping service computer to resolve the uniform resource locator of the web page from the key and forward said key to first computer”.

Emens et al. teach “the first computer being configured to cause the mapping service computer to resolve the uniform resource locator of the web page from the key and forward said key to first computer” (see [column 3, lines 50-60]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Achlioptas and Kadayam et al. by the teaching of Emens et

Art Unit: 2164

al. to add a feature of the first computer being configured to cause the mapping service computer to resolve the uniform resource locator of the web page from the key and forward said key to first computer since this feature allows the system effective way to provide users with valid access to the requested information.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

October 13, 2006

*Julie S. Wessum*  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2167